AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT

1. CONTRACT ID CODE	PAGE OF PAGES
	1 | 6

2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO.	3. EFFECTIVE DATE	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO.	5. PROJECT NO.(If applicable)
0005	10-Jul-2003	37170091	

6. ISSUED BY CODE N65540
NAVAL SURFACE WARFARE CENTER, CARDEROCK
CODE 3352, ROBERT COLOT
5001 SOUTH BROAD ST
PHILADELPHIA PA 19112-1403

7. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than item 6) CODE
See Item 6

8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (No., Street, County, State and Zip Code)

CODE FACILITY CODE

X	9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO. N65540-03-R-0006
X	9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11) 14-May-2003
	10A. MOD. OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO.
	10B. DATED (SEE ITEM 13)

11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS

[X] The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offer [X] is extended, [ ] is not extended.

Offer must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended by one of the following methods: (a) By completing Items 8 and 15, and returning 1 copies of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or telegram which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment you desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by telegram or letter, provided each telegram or letter makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.

12. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATA (If required)

13. THIS ITEM APPLIES ONLY TO MODIFICATIONS OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS.
IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NO. AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14.

[ ] A. THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED PURSUANT TO: (Specify authority) THE CHANGES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14 ARE MADE IN THE CONTRACT ORDER NO. IN ITEM 10A.

[ ] B. THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT/ORDER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES (such as changes in paying office, appropriation date, etc.) SET FORTH IN ITEM 14, PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF FAR 43.103(B).

[ ] C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF:

[ ] D. OTHER (Specify type of modification and authority)

E. IMPORTANT: Contractor [ ] is not, [ ] is required to sign this document and return _____ copies to the issuing office.

14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION (Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.)
Extend closing date

Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item 9A or 10A, as heretofore changed, remains unchanged and in full force and effect.

15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER (Type or print)		16A. NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER (Type or print)	
15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR _____ (Signature of person authorized to sign)	15C. DATE SIGNED	16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BY _____ (Signature of Contracting Officer)	16C. DATE SIGNED 10-Jul-2003

SECTION SF 30 BLOCK 14 CONTINUATION PAGE

1. The following paragraphs provide additional contractor questions regarding the solicitation and the Government's answers to the questions:

Q93. Reference Section J1, Section 3 Applicable Documents - Please provide the following NAVSEA Technical Documents referred.

NAVSEA Technical Publication S6430-AE-TED-010
NAVSEA Technical Manual, S9311-CF-MMO-010, 375kw Tech Systems (Ward Leonard) type 760R10.1 generator
NAVSEA Technical Manual, S99311-CP-MMA-010/A0106, 300Kw Ansaldo Sistemi Industriali 500/6 Generator
NAVSEA 0908-LP-000-3010 Rev 1, Shock Design for Surface Ships

A93.
NAVSEA Technical Publication S6430-AE-TED-010. This document is not approved for public release.

NAVSEA Technical Manual, S9311-CF-MMO-010, 375kw Tech Systems (Ward Leonard) type 760R10.1 generator. This document is not approved for public release. The following general description contained in the attached "MCM Generator" file is provided in lieu of this document.

NAVSEA Technical Manual, S99311-CP-MMA-010/A0106, 300Kw Ansaldo Sistemi Industriali 500/6 Generator. This document is not approved for public release. The general description contained in the attached "MHC Generator" file is provided in lieu of this document.

NAVSEA 0908-LP-000-3010 Rev 1, Shock Design for Surface Ships – provided with this amendment.

Q94. We assume MLDT is a measure of our delivering the part to a CONUS shipping point. Please concur.

A94. Logistic Down Time is a measure of time which begins with submission/receipt of order and ends upon delivery of the part to a NAVTRANS pickup point (i.e. Vendor's shipping dock – see answer to question 22). The MLDT is the collective mean logistics down time for all previous orders submitted for processing. The Vendor's shipping dock (i.e. NAVTRANS pickup point) can be either CONUS or OCONUS.

Q95. Please provide the natural frequency response of the cradles and subbases.

A95. The MHC mounting system frequencies are provided in the attached document: "MHC Mounting Fixture Frequencies". Foundations that support MCM resiliently mounted subbases shall be hard mounted to the shock barge during shock testing. The MCM applications require no tuned fixtures during shock testing, therefore, no MCM mounting system frequencies are provided.

Q96. Sections 2.4.1 – 2.4.4 require that all engines be hard mounted to the existing subbase. What is the impetus behind this requirement? Is it for shock or for engine alignment purposes?

A96. This is a shock requirement that is incorporated to minimize excursions and maintain alignment between engine and driven components as well as engine support systems (i.e. intakes and exhaust).

Q97. Please quantify in terms of Hz, the stiffness required by the phrase "The engine shall be hard mounted to the existing subbase."

A97. This statement is not typically defined in terms of Hz. Clarification: The engine to subbase connection should be bolted and not resiliently/ D.I.M. (i.e. Distributive Isolation Material) mounted.

Q98. Can an alternate to hard mounting be used if the engine meets all other requirements?

A98. No alternatives to hard mounting between the engine and subbase are allowable. This is a shock requirement that is incorporated to minimize excursions and maintain alignment between engine and driven components as well as engine support systems (i.e. intakes and exhaust).

Q99. Please provide the weights of the following components:
MCM 3-14 MPDE
- Engine
- Fluid Coupling
- Pedestal Bearing including foundation
- Clutch

MCM SSDG
- Engine
- Coupling
- Alternator

MHC MPDE
- Engine
- Clutch
- Misalignment coupling
- Gearbox with integrated fluid coupling

MCM SSDG
- Engine
- Coupling
- Alternator

A99. The following are weights for the existing components installed aboard MCM and MHC class ships:

MCM 1-2 MPDE
- ? Engine – approx. 5176 lbs.(dry) and 5731 lbs.(wet)
- ? Lo-Rez Coupling - approx. 352 lbs.
- ? Pedestal Bearing including foundation – appprox. 189 lbs (pedestal bearing assy.) + 76 lbs. (spool shaft)
- ? Clutch – approx. 299 lbs.

MCM 1-2 SSDG
- ? Engine – approx. 4856 lbs. (dry) and 5411 lbs. (wet)
- ? Coupling – approx. 283 lbs.
- ? Alternator – approx. 3650 lbs.

MCM 3-14 MPDE
- ? Engine – approx. 5086.4 lbs. (dry) and 5471.4 lbs. (wet)
- ? Fluid Coupling – approx. 525 lbs
- ? Pedestal Bearing including foundation –approx. 189 lbs (pedestal bearing assy.) + 79 lbs. (spool shaft)
- ? Clutch – approx. 299 lbs

MCM 3-14 SSDG
- ? Engine – approx. 5086.4 (dry) and 5471.4 (wet)
- ? Coupling – approx. 283 lbs.
- ? Alternator – approx. 3650 lbs.

MHC MPDE
- ? Engine – approx. 6840 (dry) and 7726 (wet)
- ? Clutch – approx. 463 lbs.
- ? Coupling (btwn engine and IFVG) – approx. 232 lbs.
- ? Gearbox with integrated fluid coupling – approx. 3844 lbs.

MHC SSDG

- ? Engine – approx. 6713 (dry) 7186 (wet)
- ? Coupling - approx. 276 lbs.
- ? Alternator – approx. 6305 lbs.

Q100. The answer to Question 20 of Amendment 3 stated that CLS would be required until completion of the contract. Given the indefinite nature of the contract it seems the Navy's needs would be better served if the CLS were based on a time or hour based reference for each shipset (i.e. 5 years or 15,000 hours, etc.). Would the buyer consider a CLS offering, per shipset of finite time or hours? Is completion of the warranty period on the final shipset the final contract date?

A100. The CLS proposal can be defined in terms of calendar time as well as engine operational hours as stated in the question. The offeror's proposal shall address the requirement based on calendar time at a minimum – operating hour reference will be in addition to calendar time requirement. Engine operating hour criteria shall meet or exceed maximum anticipated operating hours specified in Section J, Attachment 1. Final contract date will be five years from date of contract award. Warranty shall be standard commercial warranty in accordance with RFP, section I, Clause CAR-113 "Standard Commercial Warranty (Jan 92)".

Q101. SECTION/PARA. 2.7.3.2 Diesel Engine Technical Specification: The MHC compound mounting system shall include the subbase, intermediate mass, including acoustic enclosure if applicable, resilient mounts and resilient mount snubbers set to shipboard installation gaps. Does the Government intend to provide drawings for all of the structures and the resilient mounts including their frequencies? The information is required for the preparation of pricing.

A101. The government does intend to provide drawings for all structures and the resilient mounts after contract award. The following initial information is provided for proposal preparation: Subbase and Intermediate seismic mass drawing - typical (see attached files). The MHC mounting system frequencies are also provided in the additional attached document: "MHC Mounting Fixture Frequencies". Foundations that support MCM resiliently mounted subbases shall be hard mounted to the shock barge during shock testing. The MCM applications require no tuned fixtures during shock testing, therefore, no MCM mounting system frequencies are provided.

Q102. RFP Amendment 0003, page 12, item 2 states a new clause is added to Section L of the solicitation, which requires the offerors in their proposal, to include technical details of any required modifications to existing ship systems and all costs to perform any such modifications. Does Answer 19, page 5 of this amendment mean that the MHC enclosure is no longer considered an existing ship system?

A102. The MHC enclosure is currently considered an existing ship system. The enclosure essentially consists of the upper portion of the enclosure (i.e. access doors, hatches, frame) and the lower portion of the enclosure (i.e. subbase and intermediate seismic mass). Since the upper portion of the existing enclosure (i.e. above the subbase and intermediate seismic mass) will be removed or replaced, the "impact to ship systems" criteria only applies to the lower portion of the existing enclosure.

Q103. RFP Amendment 0003, page 5, Answer 19 states that the government will require the existing enclosure to be removed under the follow on Design and Installation contract. The contractor for the follow on contract will be required to meet a general noise threshold requirement that may or may not require an enclosure but will require the existing enclosure to be removed. Does this mean that there is no technical or cost advantage of having an engine which can fit into the existing enclosure and meet the noise requirement?

A103. There is no technical or cost advantage because the existing enclosure (i.e. above the subbase and intermediate seismic mass) will be either removed or replaced.

Q104. RFP page 90, Interface states the offeror shall describe and demonstrate the ability of the proposed engines to be installed while minimizing changes/impact to existing shipboard systems including ie. enclosure (MHC only). Does this mean that amendment 0003 has changed the government's original requirement and the offeror is no longer required to describe changes or impact to the MHC enclosure?

A104. The existing enclosure includes the enclosure itself as well as the subbase and intermediate seismic mass). The offeror is no longer required to describe changes to the existing MHC enclosure above the engine mounting surface. The lower portion of the existing enclosure (i.e. the subbase and intermediate seismic mass) will be retained as an existing ship system and any required changes to those components shall be addressed in the proposal.

Q105. RFP Amendment 0003, item 2 states a new clause is added to Section L of the solicitation, which requires the offerors in their proposal, to include technical details of any required modifications to existing ship systems and all costs to perform any such modification. Review of the RFP prior to the inclusion of the new clause in amendment 0003, indicated modifications to ship interfaces would be priced in the install effort, which would be included in a later RFP covering install. No line items are included in the current RFP for which prices can be bid to cover this modification to existing systems.

Does the government, for purposes of clearly identifying prices and ease of determining cost reasonableness, intend to assign distinct additional line items for which prices can be bid?

Since the contract is Firm Fixed Price, does the government intend that these additional line items will also be Firm Fixed Price?

Does the government plan to incorporate these line items into the RFP evaluation criteria?

A105. The answer to Q105 is identical to the answer provided for Q84 in Amendment 4: Clarification: The Contractor for this solicitation is not responsible for all shipboard installation modifications but would be responsible for modifying the rotational direction or operational speed of the generator, if specified in the offeror’s proposal. Offerors can propose solutions that require rotational direction or operational speed modification of the driven generator as long as the end result is achieved and is clearly defined within the proposal. However, one of the goals of this engine conversion is to minimize impacts to existing shipboard systems. "Impact to ship systems" is covered under the technical evaluation factor of "Engine Design, Interface and Maintainability Characteristics" which will be evaluated as stated in Section M of the solicitation. The successful offeror will be required to perform any such rotational modification or operational speed of the driven generator. Proposals that include such modifications to the existing generator shall include technical details of the required modification in the technical proposal. All costs to perform any such rotational or speed modification of the existing generator must be included in the offeror's proposal." This cost, if required, shall be included in the price of the corresponding engine.

Q106. Section 2.4.2 g) and h) give the 110% and 150% overloads of the MCM SSDG as 330 kW and 450 kW respectively. This would indicate that the maximum continuous electrical load is 300 kW. This is inconsistent with the 375 kW generator rating in sections 2.2.4 and 2.2.6. Please clarify.

A106. Clarification. The requirements specified in section J, Attachment 1, paragraphs 2.4.2 f, g, h and 2.4.4 h, i, j were original ship generator specification requirements. These requirements differ from the prime mover (i.e. diesel engine rating) requirements in paragraph 2.2. Although the generator sets are rated at 375 and 300 kW respectively, the engine ratings in terms of horsepower are slightly higher than the actual generator set output. The engine rating differs from the generator output rating in order to account for efficiency / driving losses between the two components. Paragraph 2.2 shall be used for defining engine rating requirements in the offeror’s proposal. The following paragraphs shall be removed from the Attachment 1 specification in order to eliminate further confusion:

- 2.4.2 f.
- 2.4.2 g.
- 2.4.2 h.
- 2.4.4 h.
- 2.4.4 i.
- 2.4.4 j.

2. The following paragraphs are removed from the Attachment 1 specification in order to eliminate further confusion:

- ? 2.4.2 f.
- ? 2.4.2 g.
- ? 2.4.2 h.
- ? 2.4.4 h.
- ? 2.4.4 i.
- ? 2.4.4 j.

3. The deadline for submitting questions regarding the solicitation is established as 2:00 P.M., 11 July 2003.

4.The hour and date for receipt of offers is extended to 4:00 P.M. EST, 21 July 2003.

Attachments
General Description of MCM Class Generators
General Description of MHC Generator
Subbase and Intermediate seismic mass drawing – typical
MHC Mounting System Frequencies
NAVSEA 0908-LP-000-3010 Rev 1, Shock Design for Surface Ships